AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to the drawings because: Figures 1-4 should be designated by a legend such as – Prior Art – because only that which is old is illustrated. Applicant's representative submits herewith a complete set of corrected Formal Drawings each labeled as "Replacement Sheet."

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the current application. In an Office Action dated December 18, 2006, the Examiner objected to the abstract, objected to Figures 1-4, objected to claims 1-7 and 9-16, rejected claims 1-5, 9, 11-14, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Arbaugh et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,185,678 B1 ("Arbaugh"), rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbaugh in view of Abgrall et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0037237 A1 ("Abgrall"), and rejected claims 6-7, 10, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbaugh in view of Byers et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,959,184 B1 ("Byers").

Applicant's representative has amended the abstract to address the Examiner's objections to the abstract, has amended Figures 1-4 to address the Examiner's objection to the drawings, and has amended claims 1-7 and 9-16 to address the Examiner's objections to the claims. Applicant's representative wishes to thank the Examiner for sufficiently carefully reading the current application to identify the problems cited by the Examiner in the objections.

Applicant's representative respectfully traverses the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejections of the current claims. The Examiner relies on the cited reference Arbaugh in all 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections. However, Arbaugh is unrelated to the disclosure and claims of the current application.

As discussed in the current application in the Summary of the Invention section, and as clearly shown in Figure 5 (510 and 512) and in Figure 6 (602 and 604), method embodiments of the current application rely on a "pair of write-once CDs, or other, similar data storage media, each pair of CDs containing an identical sequence of encryption keys" (current application, page 5, lines 18-19.) This pair of data-storage media is explicitly claimed, for example, in claim 1 of the current application as the third element: "a pair of data-storage media each containing a sequence of encryption keys, one data-storage medium local to the monitor, and the other data-storage medium local to the remote computer system."

The Examiner cites column 5, lines 20-23 and column 10, lines 44-51 of Arbaugh as teaching this third element of claim 1. The cited portions of Arbaugh teach nothing of the sort. Lines 20-23 of column 5 of Arbaugh read as follows: "centralized updates to be done in the following manner. When the server receives the 'I am booting' message from the client, the server would check a database containing the configuration of the client. The server would then compare." Nothing in this passage teaches, discloses, mentions, or even suggests encryption keys or a data-storage medium of any kind that stores a sequence of encryption keys. Reading on through the next three lines of Arbaugh, one discovers that Arbaugh is referring, in this passage, to an automated update procedure wherein the configuration of the computer is analyzed to determine whether or not components of the computer should be updated. The word "configuration" refers, in Arbaugh and in computer sciences, software engineering, and computer systems, in general, to a list of currently installed components within a computer system. Such a configuration is not a sequence of encryption keys.

Lines 44-51 of column 10 of Arbaugh read, as follows: "The trusted repository can either be an expansion ROM board, not shown, that contains verified copies of the required software or it could be a network host 254. The use of network host 254 as the trusted repository is accomplished with the addition of an inexpensive PROM board, and modifications to AEGIS ROM 256. BIOS 112 and AEGIS ROM 256 contain the verification code, and public key certificates. AEGIS ROM 256 also contains code."

As discussed beginning on line 39 of column 8 of Arbaugh, AEGIS is an architecture for a computer-system initialization that comprises modifications to the BIOS of the computer system. AEGIS is an architecture, not a remote computer system or a local computer system. The modifications comprising AEGIS are made to the BIOS of a computer system in order to provide for a secure boot procedure within the computer system. The cited portion of column 10 refers to the fact that, when AEGIS BIOS detects an innvalid component within the computer system during the boot process, the AEGIS BIOS can recover by copying a replacement software component into the computer system, obtaining the copy from AEGIS ROM or, in certain cases, as recovery code

obtained from a trusted host, or trusted repository. It is true that the AEGIS system uses public key certificates in order to validate software components, but there is no teaching, mention, or suggestion of any kind of pair of data-storage media containing sequences of encryption keys, one local to a monitor, and another local to a remote computer system. Arbaugh is concerned with monitoring security of a computer system, but instead discloses boot procedures carried out by constructing a chain of integrity checks, as discussed in the first paragraph of the summary of the invention section of Arbaugh, beginning on line 33 of column 4, and is also concerned with creation of a log in a trusted repository, as discussed beginning on line 65 of column 4, that can be accessed by a system administrator to detect and diagnose failed workstations. Thus, in Arbaugh, the only monitor that Applicant's representative can find mention of is a human, system administrator. Moreover, this monitor monitors a collection of remote workstations to detect failed workstations, and not to monitor the security state of the remote computer systems. Again, the security state of the computer systems is ensured by constructing a chain of integrity checks within each computer system by the modified BIOS within each computer system.

Like claim 1, independent claim 9 of the current application includes an element "providing a pair of data-storage media, each containing a sequence of encryption keys, one data-storage medium local to the monitor computing device, and the other data-storage medium local to the remote computer system." As discussed above, Arbaugh does not teach, disclose, mention, or even suggest a pair of data-storage media, each containing a sequence of encryption keys, local to a monitor computing device and the other local to a remote computer system. Therefore, like claim 1, claim 9 cannot possibly be anticipated by Arbaugh. Because all of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections depend on Arbaugh as teaching the elements of independent claims 1 and 9, all of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections are unfounded.

In Applicant's representative's opinion, all of the claims remaining in the current application are clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Hyser
Olympic Patent Works PLLC

Robert W. Bergstrom
Registration No. 39,906

Enclosures:
    Postcard
    Transmittal in duplicate

Olympic Patent Works PLLC
P.O. Box 4277
Seattle, WA 98194-0277
206.621.1933 telephone
206.621.5302 fax